

This legislation will provide much needed assistance to the victims of the floods, and support our Nation's peacekeeping efforts in the former Yugoslavia.

Those provisions which were included in the first submission of this legislation to the President for his signature have been removed. The subjects that were included; an automatic budget resolution, federally funded roads into national forest areas, and restriction of sampling in any future Census.

These areas are serious and each should be considered under the well established congressional legislative democratic process, through hearings, markup, and floor debate. Their exclusion from this Emergency Supplemental Appropriations therefore was the right course for the House leadership to take. Now, we can begin the process of seeking the best policy to further the interest of all Americans in each of these areas.

I believe that every Member of this body will agree that the suffering of others as a result of any cause is difficult to see. The pain of people who are the victims of natural disaster is particularly painful. There is nothing this body could do to legislate the next natural disaster out of existence, but we can agree that we will never again let issues that are unrelated enter into the legislative relief effort.

The least that Members of this body can offer the next victims of natural disaster in our country, is the promise that their best interest will be our only consideration when rendering them aid and assistance through funding legislation.

I would ask that my colleagues join me in support of H.R. 1871, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, Send It Clean. This is not a complicated message: Send It Clean, Mr. Speaker. It's been 85 days since the President asked the Congress for a disaster relief bill, and for 85 days the Republican leadership has played politics with the lives of suffering Americans. These people have asked for only one thing: Relief. What has the GOP responded with? More pain and suffering.

This is not a complicated message: Send It Clean, Mr. Speaker. This is what the President has been saying; This is what the American people have been saying; This is what House Democrats have been saying; This is what Republicans have been ignoring for 85 days.

Disaster Relief was never the place for the Republican agenda to be advanced. Extraneous bills should be argued on their own merits, and be allowed to stand or fall on those merits.

The folks trying to rebuild their lives in California, North Dakota, Minnesota, Arkansas, and Louisiana are waiting for word that the Democrats are not the only ones listening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the bill is considered read for amendment, and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were— yeas 348, nays 74, answered "present" 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

YEAS—348

Abercrombie	English	Kucinich
Ackerman	Ensign	LaHood
Aderholt	Eshoo	Lampson
Allen	Etheridge	Lantos
Andrews	Evans	Latham
Bachus	Everett	LaTourette
Baesler	Ewing	Lazio
Baker	Fattah	Leach
Baldacci	Fawell	Levin
Ballenger	Fazio	Lewis (CA)
Barcia	Filner	Lewis (GA)
Barrett (NE)	Foglietta	Lewis (KY)
Barrett (WI)	Foley	Linder
Bateman	Ford	Lipinski
Becerra	Fowler	Livingston
Bentsen	Fox	LoBiondo
Bereuter	Frank (MA)	Lofgren
Berman	Franks (NJ)	Lowey
Berry	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Bilirakis	Frost	Luther
Bishop	Furse	Maloney (CT)
Blagojevich	Gallegly	Maloney (NY)
Bliley	Ganske	Manton
Blumenauer	Gejdenson	Manzullo
Blunt	Gekas	Markey
Boehrlert	Gephardt	Mascara
Bonior	Gibbons	Matsui
Bono	Gilchrest	McCarthy (MO)
Borski	Gillmor	McCarthy (NY)
Boswell	Gilman	McCollum
Boucher	Gonzalez	McCrery
Boyd	Goode	McGovern
Brown (CA)	Goodlatte	McHale
Brown (FL)	Gordon	McHugh
Brown (OH)	Goss	McIntyre
Bryant	Granger	McKeon
Bunning	Green	McKinney
Calvert	Greenwood	McNulty
Camp	Gutierrez	Meehan
Canady	Gutknecht	Meek
Capps	Hall (OH)	Menendez
Cardin	Hall (TX)	Metcalf
Carson	Hamilton	Millender
Castle	Hansen	McDonald
Chabot	Harman	Minge
Chenoweth	Hastings (FL)	Mink
Clay	Hastings (WA)	Moakley
Clayton	Hayworth	Molinari
Clement	Hefner	Mollohan
Clyburn	Herger	Moran (KS)
Coble	Hill	Moran (VA)
Condit	Hilliard	Morella
Conyers	Hinche	Murtha
Cook	Hinojosa	Nadler
Cooksey	Hobson	Neal
Costello	Holden	Nethercutt
Coyne	Hooley	Ney
Cramer	Horn	Northup
Crapo	Hostettler	Oberstar
Cubin	Houghton	Obey
Cummings	Hoyer	Olver
Cunningham	Hutchinson	Ortiz
Danner	Hyde	Owens
Davis (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Oxley
Davis (IL)	Jackson-Lee	Packard
Davis (VA)	(TX)	Pallone
DeFazio	Jefferson	Pappas
DeGette	Jenkins	Parker
Delahunt	John	Pascrell
DeLauro	Johnson (CT)	Pastor
Dellums	Johnson (WI)	Payne
Deutsch	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)
Diaz-Balart	Kanjorski	Peterson (PA)
Dickey	Kaptur	Pickering
Dicks	Kasich	Pickett
Dingell	Kelly	Pitts
Dixon	Kennedy (MA)	Pombo
Doggett	Kennedy (RI)	Pomeroy
Dooley	Kennelly	Porter
Doolittle	Kildee	Portman
Doyle	Kilpatrick	Poshard
Dreier	Kim	Price (NC)
Dunn	Kind (WI)	Pryce (OH)
Edwards	King (NY)	Quinn
Ehlers	Klecza	Radanovich
Ehrlich	Klink	Rahall
Emerson	Knollenberg	Ramstad
Engel	Kolbe	Rangel

Redmond	Skelton	Torres
Regula	Slaughter	Towns
Reyes	Smith (NJ)	Traffant
Riggs	Smith (OR)	Turner
Rivers	Smith (TX)	Velazquez
Rodriguez	Smith, Adam	Vento
Roemer	Smith, Linda	Visclosky
Rogan	Snyder	Walsh
Rogers	Solomon	Wamp
Ros-Lehtinen	Spence	Waters
Rothman	Spratt	Watkins
Roukema	Stabenow	Watt (NC)
Roybal-Allard	Stark	Watts (OK)
Sabo	Stokes	Waxman
Sanchez	Strickland	Weldon (PA)
Sanders	Stump	Weller
Sandlin	Stupak	Wexler
Sawyer	Sununu	Weygand
Saxton	Talent	White
Schumer	Tanner	Whitfield
Scott	Tauscher	Wicker
Serrano	Tauzin	Wise
Shaw	Taylor (MS)	Wolf
Sherman	Taylor (NC)	Woolsey
Shimkus	Thomas	Wynn
Shuster	Thompson	Yates
Sisisky	Thune	Young (AK)
Skaggs	Thurman	Young (FL)
Skeen	Turner	

NAYS—74

Archer	Duncan	Paxon
Armey	Goodling	Pease
Barr	Graham	Petri
Bartlett	Hastert	Riley
Barton	Hefley	Rohrabacher
Bass	Hilleary	Royce
Billbray	Hoekstra	Ryun
Boehner	Hulshof	Salmon
Bonilla	Hunter	Sanford
Brady	Inglis	Scarborough
Burr	Istook	Schaefer, Dan
Burton	Johnson, Sam	Schaffer, Bob
Buyer	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Callahan	Kingston	Sessions
Campbell	Klug	Shadegg
Cannon	Largent	Shays
Chambliss	McInnis	Smith (MI)
Christensen	McIntosh	Snowbarger
Coburn	Mica	Stearns
Collins	Miller (FL)	Stenholm
Combest	Myrick	Thornberry
Cox	Neumann	Tiahrt
Crane	Norwood	Upton
Deal	Nussle	Weldon (FL)
DeLay	Paul	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Souder

NOT VOTING—11

Farr	Martinez	Pelosi
Flake	McDade	Rush
Forbes	McDermott	Schiff
LaFalce	Miller (CA)	

□ 1707

Messrs. CALLAHAN, WELDON of Florida, RILEY, HUNTER, and BARTLETT of Maryland changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DOOLEY of California and Mr. SKAGGS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purposes of inquiring what the schedule will be for tomorrow and the remainder of the week and for next week. Mr. Speaker, I am primarily interested in the time issue as much as I am in substance, and I think it would

be helpful for our colleagues if they knew when we would be meeting next week and when we can expect our first votes. If we do not have the substance of the schedule next week, I understand that, but if we can get some sense.

I have been given a tentative schedule, Mr. Speaker, that says we will have a pro forma session at noon on Monday; and then on Tuesday, we will go in at 12:30 for morning session, 2 o'clock for legislative business, and no recorded votes before 5 p.m.; and then also on Tuesday, the Private Calendar, five suspension bills; and on Wednesday and the balance of the week, we will meet at 10 a.m. and we will do the Sea Grant bill and the National Defense Authorization bill. That is a tentative schedule, and if that is helpful to our colleagues, I would like to have that verified by the other side, if they could.

Well, we will assume, Mr. Speaker, that that is the schedule for next week, and I wish all my colleagues a good weekend.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 16, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourns to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HOURLY MEETING ON TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, June 16, 1997, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 17, 1997 for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING ORDER OF HOUSE OF MAY 7, 1997 THROUGH JUNE 24, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the House of May 7, 1997, be extended through Tuesday, June 24, 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MIDDLE CLASS TAX CUTS FOR FATHERS

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, with Father's Day coming up, what can we do to help dads and to help parents and help children? Our tax burden right now is one of the biggest problems of raising kids. I know. I have a family of four. If you have a combined income of \$55,000, \$22,000 of that goes to taxes. Indeed, there are 62 taxes hidden in a gallon of gas and 109 in a loaf of bread.

The Republican bill gives much needed middle class tax relief, for capital gains tax, HOPE scholarships, IRA expansion, death tax penalty, and, most importantly, to the fathers on Father's Day the \$500 per child tax credit.

Tax relief gives dads more time to stay at home to spend time with their children and impart values for the next generation. Unless the critics continue with the class envy that they are so clever at and so good, let me say that 71 percent of these taxes go to people with incomes of \$75,000 or less and only 1.2 percent with incomes over \$200,000. This is a middle class tax cut for fathers, and it is the Republican tax plan. I hope our Democrats will join us in supporting it.

The following shows the amount of tax relief received by people of various income categories over a five year period, according to data provided by the Joint Committee on Taxation: Under \$20,000, —\$5.5 billion (4.7%); \$20,000 to \$75,000, —\$83.5 billion (71.7%); \$75,000 to \$100,000, —\$19.3 billion (16.6%); \$100,000 to \$200,000, —\$6.7 billion (5.8%); \$200,000+, —\$1.4 billion (1.2%).

□ 1715

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

ATTEMPTS DURING BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS TO COME THROUGH THE BACK DOOR ON ISSUES OF WORKER PAY AND PROTECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. WATERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of this House the fact that we have some actions that are going on as we attempt to bring together this budget and to reconcile the differences in the deliberations that have gone on, attempts to come through the back door on some very important issues.

I am very concerned about attempts to treat welfare recipients who are

would-be welfare workers differently than we treat other workers in America's workplace. I am concerned that there is an attempt to pay welfare workers less than minimum wage. I am also concerned that there is an attempt to deny workplace protections for recipients who go to work. I am also concerned that along with these two mean-spirited denials of protections in the workplace we find an attempt to deny protection from discrimination.

One would ask, how could this be in 1997, when all of these gains that have been made are gains that were hard fought for, gains that individuals made tremendous sacrifices for? How could we in 1997 have attempts to turn back the clock?

We know that in the last Congress there were some attempts by Republicans to deny an increase in minimum wage. That issue was hotly debated. We had the American public join in that debate in ways that we have not had the American public involved in in a long time. We engaged the citizens of this country in that debate. The citizens spoke in a loud and clear voice.

What did they say to us? They said, not only do we want an increase in minimum wage, we want the American people to be paid fairly for their labor. We do not think this increase is enough. We think it should be more. We do not like the fact that major CEO's in America are making a million dollars while there is an attempt to continue to squeeze the workers at the bottom. We do not like the fact that entry-level wages have gone down. We do not like the fact that more and more Americans are on part-time labor. We do not like the fact that American workers are going to the negotiating table, not fighting for increases, but are forced to have to fight to hold onto the gains that have been made historically.

So the American people spoke, and they spoke loud and clear. When the American people spoke, we discovered that even some of those on the other side of the aisle who had been attempting to deny this increase in minimum wage got the message. They got the message and they joined with us in the final analysis and supported the increase in minimum wage.

I thought all of the Republicans had learned a lesson. I thought they had heard the American public. But obviously that is not the case, because what we see now is a back-door attempt, a back-door attempt to not only deny that increase that we made for low-wage workers, but an attempt to single out a category of workers and pay them less than the minimum wage. What they could not do in the front door they are now trying to do through the back door.

What they are literally doing is sending a message out to workers, many of them who only make minimum wages, your job is in jeopardy. Your job is in jeopardy because we have found a whole new class of people that we are